

I think it is a priority for the American people. That is why we are here tonight is to point out that there are thousands of American citizens who think this lawsuit ought to be pursued and that, in the end, this is not about lawsuits, it is not about money, it is not about even keeping score, it is about our children in particular and about the costs that tobacco use imposes on our society.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank my colleague very much for those comments. And let me follow on one of the thoughts that came out of what the gentleman just said and this New York Times editorial I just talked about.

There was a paragraph in there that I thought was particularly interesting that should be illuminated on a little bit. People may wonder why the Times said this. They said in the editorial, "the interests of industrial campaign backers before its duty to protect the public health." They were accusing the Bush administration of showing a troubling propensity to put the interests of industrial campaign backers before the duty of public health.

So what are they talking about there? And I have been following this very closely, because we all know when we run in campaigns and we are active and we are out there and doing fundraising the, fund-raising can tell us a lot about actions and agenda and those kinds of things. We have just finished here tonight a discussion of campaign finance reform, and so if we look at the Center for Responsive Politics and what they have researched on money in the last election, 83 percent, 83 percent of the tobacco contributions went to the Republican Party.

So when they talk about following contributors, I think that is what they are talking about there. If we look at individual contributions, \$90,000 went specifically to the Bush campaign, only \$8,000 to the Gore campaign. So we are talking about another large amount in terms of differences. A large disparity.

So the bottom line here is that President Bush has got to get a new negotiator. I wrote what I considered a very congenial letter. The gentleman mentioned it in his comments, a congenial letter to the President saying this is a problem, this is a conflict, this has an appearance, a serious appearance problem. This gentleman has come to the job with a bias and you have to get a new negotiator to protect the public interest.

Now, I do not have anybody in mind, and I would not be presumptuous to tell the President who to pick as his negotiator. He clearly needs someone he can trust, and he ought to replace the current Attorney General and just have him step aside on this. But the other way, it seems to me, with this whole cloud that is out there over this settlement, to take care of this, is to involve the State attorneys general.

There is nobody in the Nation with more credibility on this issue than the State attorneys general. They sued the

tobacco companies. They were the first ones to bring them to the table. They were the very first ones to get a settlement out of the tobacco companies. No other lawyers had ever done this before. The tobacco companies always used to wave their fingers at us and say, we fight to the end. If you file against us, we are going to fight it to the end and we have never paid a penny. Well, they paid \$240 billion. So that is a pretty penny there, I will tell you.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Again asking my colleague to yield, I would note that the President certainly is a proponent of Federalism. He certainly has taken the position in many cases that the States ought to have an important role in a lot of the decisions that are made in our country, and this suggestion that my colleague has brought up in his letter, I think, fits his philosophical approach, and bringing in the experts to work on behalf of all of the Americans and the attorney generals as my colleague suggests, Democrat, Republican, covering the whole political ideological spectrum, I think the gentleman mentioned 45 of them joined this case.

I would just urge the President to again look at the gentleman's letter. I am hopeful that we will have a response from him sooner rather than later.

□ 1945

If I might, since we were talking about the costs, I might touch on that one more time. It is easy to say these are other people's problems. It is easy to say we are all adults, and if one decides to smoke, they should bear some of the responsibility. There is some truth in both of those statements, but we are talking about doing all we can to make sure that children are not targeted. Children who begin smoking are much more likely to remain smokers throughout their lives.

Even if we feel there is some responsibility that adults have, and we do have those responsibilities, the costs that are incurred we all have to bear. We can acknowledge those costs or turn a blind eye to those costs.

The tobacco industry spent over \$8 billion in 1999 on advertising and promotional campaigns. That is \$22 million a day spent on these campaigns.

Now there is \$89 billion in total annual private and public health care expenditures caused by tobacco use; \$17 billion annual Federal and State Medicaid payments directly caused by tobacco use; \$20.5 billion Federal Government Medicare expenditures each year that are attributed to tobacco use; and \$8 billion other Federal Government tobacco-caused health care costs in particular through our Veterans Administration health care.

There is \$2.1 billion in addition annual expenditures through Social Security survivors insurance, the SSI program, for kids who have lost one or both parents through smoking-caused death.

Mr. Speaker, one that really catches my attention, \$1.4 billion to \$4 billion in additional annual expenditures for health and developmental problems of infants caused by mothers who smoke and for those infants who were exposed to secondhand smoke after they were born and, of course, during pregnancy.

These are very significant costs that we all bear as a society, and this is why I think it is very important that we continue to pursue the resolution of this situation. We ask the tobacco companies to carry their fair share.

I was curious to hear a little more, if it fits the rest of the gentleman's comments, about what the State of New Mexico has done about the monies from the settlement. You talked about California, but I am interested in how we can reduce the size of these statistics that I have just shared.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his comments. The State of New Mexico is planning to get about \$1.2 billion under the master settlement. That is the largest civil settlement in the State of New Mexico. The way that this settlement was worked out, it will flow in over 25 years. We do not have all \$1.2 billion at this time. We are getting smaller amounts, and they balloon up over time.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about some of the proposals that were out there and then what they are actually doing now, and maybe we can get into a discussion on that. First of all, the public health community came forward, many of these cancer doctors, the oncologists came forward, and the American Cancer Society and the American Lung Society, all of them came forward and said, we need to work on specifically how we spend these dollars.

They came up with what I thought were some very good recommendations. First of all, we could start a trust fund. One of the best recommendations, and I was very supportive of this and worked with my legislature, set up a trust fund and try to get the trust fund to the level that it was way up there in dollars so we could then use the principal rather than using the capital. If you took a lot of this money and put it into a trust fund, then there could be a perpetual flow of money to deal with the tobacco issues.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, so the gentleman is suggesting to treat it as an endowment for our children's future, and direct the return and the interest off the endowment into these efforts, and it would be a very conservative way to proceed, and that would ensure that those monies were there into perpetuity for use of citizens in the gentleman's home State?

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. And what we were trying to do in recommending some kind of trust fund was to say these issues are not going away. The tobacco companies are advertising, and they are still out there. We prevented them from targeting kids, but